



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AUGUST DILLMANN.

By the REVEREND GEORGE L. ROBINSON,
Berlin, Germany.

The loss sustained by Germany through the death on July 4, 1894, of the renowned Æthiopic scholar and Old Testament exegete, DR. AUGUST DILLMANN, deserves comment both on account of his philological investigations in Semitics and of the numerous and valuable works of which he was the author. What Franz Delitzsch was to Leipzig and Abraham Kuenen to Leiden, August Dillmann was to Berlin. We can here give but a sketch of his life and writings.

Christian Friedrich August Dillmann was born on the 25th of April, 1823, in Illingen (Württemberg). Having received his gymnasium training in Stuttgart and Schöndal, he entered at seventeen the University of Tübingen, and there devoted himself for five years to the study of philosophy, theology, and especially oriental languages. He was the pupil of Heinrich Ewald, one of the greatest orientalists and biblical exegetes that Germany ever produced. On leaving the University he entered the ministry and preached from October, 1845, till May, 1846. He then returned to Tübingen and in May of 1846 obtained the degree of Ph.D. Through his love for Semitics, the summer of 1846 found him in Paris in the interests of Æthiopic. In the autumn of the same year he went to England, and spent from September, 1846 till April, 1848, searching among the Æthiopic manuscripts in the British Museum of London and the Bodleian library at Oxford. Here he found numerous manuscripts and not only became interested himself in their decipherment, but succeeded in enlisting the interest of the librarians also. Returning to Tübingen in July, 1848, he became *Repetent* in Semitics. In the autumn of 1851 he was made *Privat-docent* in theology, and in February, 1853, *Professor-extraordinarius*. From Tübingen he was called in October, 1854, to succeed Justus Olshausen in Kiel in the philosophical faculty. On Dec. 2, 1859, he was made



Dr. A. Dillmann.

Professor-ordinarius. Three years later the degree of Dr. Theol. was conferred upon him by the University of Leipzig. From Kiel he was called to Giessen in April, 1864, as Professor of Theology. Here he lectured (having among others B. Stade under him) until October, 1869, when he was called to Berlin to succeed E. W. Hengstenberg in the chair of Old Testament theology. He remained in Berlin twenty-five years, indeed until the time of his death. During this period he was Rector of the University in 1875-76; and at his death was Dean of the theological faculty. He was also in 1881 president of the Fifth International Oriental Congress. During his professorial life he received and declined calls to Marburg, Zürich, Halle, Vienna, and Tübingen (three times). He was also a member of numerous Academies and scientific and oriental societies.

As an orientalist, Dillmann was preëminently an Æthiopic scholar. He gave a large portion of his time to the language of Abyssinia. In his inaugural address on entering the Academy of Science in Berlin in 1877, he declares that for over thirty years he devoted more than one-half of his time to the study of this interesting but quite forgotten language. For more than 150 years *Geez* (or Æthiopic as it has been called since the sixteenth century) had been entirely neglected by the oriental scholars of Europe and the Occident. In his study therefore, Dillmann was practically without the helps which a student of other Semitic languages has at hand. The only source from which he could obtain any real assistance was the work of Hiob Ludolf who died in 1704. At first he stood quite alone as few were able to follow him. Oftentimes, he says, he could not resist the thought that he was devoting himself to a laborious work to no purpose. Recently, however, Semitic scholars have begun to recognize the value of Æthiopic literature and history. Dillmann himself was first led into its study by purely theological investigations. His primary aim was to discover and publish the book of Enoch. This took him to France and England in search of possible manuscripts. Thus by discovery, fields of Æthiopic literature were opened up to him. He at once set to work to catalogue the various manuscripts, and by doing so not only secured for him-

self fame, but set the direction of his life's work. These catalogues were published in 1847-48. Three years later appeared the book of *Enoch* in Æthiopic, and in 1853 the same translated and explained. Not long after appeared also his *Octateuchus Æthiopicus*, and in 1857 his *Æthiopic Grammar*, which for more than a quarter of a century remained the standard. The book of *Jubilees* followed two years later, and in 1865 his greatest work a *Lexicon* of the Æthiopic language in Latin. (He apologizes in the preface to his Grammar for writing in *German*.) These two works, viz., his Grammar and Lexicon, Ernst Curtius designated, when he received Dillmann into the Academy of Science in Berlin, as "Monumente deutscher Geisteskraft." Following these there appeared in 1866 his *Æthiopic Chrestomathy*, in 1871 the books of the *Kings*, in 1877 the *Ascension of Isaiah*, in 1878 the *Abyssinian Manuscripts* of the Royal Library in Berlin, and in 1894 his last published work, just completed a few days before his death, the books of the *Apocrypha*. But in addition to this library of Æthiopic literature, Dr. Dillmann has contributed other works quite as valuable, and through which he is better known to the theological world. These are his five famous commentaries on the Old Testament, namely, "Genesis," "Exodus and Leviticus," "Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua," "Isaiah," and "Job." For thoroughness of scholarship these commentaries are among the very best. Those on the Hexateuch are, to use the words of C. H. H. Wright, "among the most important biblical works of modern times." In addition to these Dillmann wrote numerous articles for encyclopædias, and for religious and scientific periodicals. As an Old Testament critic Dillmann (with Kittel) stood quite alone, having been for several years past the most formidable antagonist of the Grafian school. His position in criticism is, therefore, important and worthy of more than the following brief exposition.

1. *His position with reference to the Hexateuch.*

Dr. Dillmann sets forth his views on the Hexateuch in the *Dissertation* which closes his "Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua." Not being able to accept the unity of the Pentateuch

as maintained by Hengstenberg, and believing thoroughly in a historico-philological science of biblical criticism, he followed the leadings of his philological training. In his commentary on Genesis he gives his reasons for analyzing the Pentateuch into distinct codes. They are chiefly these: 1. There are in the book of Genesis all kinds of conspicuous and needless repetitions. 2. Many accounts are not necessary for strengthening the story. 3. There are accounts which oppose and exclude each other, because the event can have happened only once or in one way. 4. There are also irreconcilable statements. 5. Others, standing where they now are, are a riddle. 6. Especially certain time-reckonings cannot be harmonized with oneness of authorship. On these grounds Dillmann proceeds to analyze the Hexateuch. His nomenclature is as follows: *A* is the *Grundschrift*,¹ or Priester-codex as it originally was, or *P* of others. *B* is the *Elohistic* code, or *E* of others. *C* is the *Jehovistic*, or *J*. And *D*, as commonly, is the original kernel of Deuteronomy.

The determining factor in Dillmann's critical position is his disposition of *P*, which he assigns to the period *before the exile*. He holds that such laws as are found in *P* were possible in the ninth century, for the prophets furnish us with polemics against the overestimation and alienation of the cult, which shows that already the cult was built out in this direction (*Num.*, *Dt.*, *Josh.*, p. 662). That a hierarchical system was then in vogue is self-evident, and Deuteronomy furnishes nothing against it (*id.* pp. 652, 659). Also the promise of "eternal possession of the land" in *Gen.* 17:8, he considers, more appropriate to pre-exilic than to post-exilic times (p. 667). Furthermore, *P* contains a list of statutes and laws, which for the post-exilic times were impractical, *e. g.*, the territories of the twelve tribes, concerning the Levites and the cities of refuge, laws of war and right of booty, the ark of the covenant, Urim and Thummim, and the anointing

¹ Dillmann distinguishes, as Wellhausen, Kuenen, and others, different strata in *P*.

(a) For example, his *Grundschrift*, *A*, is the same as *Q* of Delitzsch and Wellhausen, and *P*² of Holzinger (*Einleitung in den Hex.* 1893), and *P*² of Kuenen and Cornill.

(b) And his *Sinai-gesetz*. *S*, which consists chiefly of the holiness laws of *Lev.* 17-26, is the same as *H* of Klostermann, *P*¹ of Holzinger, and *P*¹ of Kuenen and Cornill.

of the high priests which did not begin in that time and which were not used after the exile (p. 67of.). He therefore is convinced that P is pre-exilic, and is probably best to be assigned to a date circa 800 B.C. (as Nöldeke). At this time the legendary history was, as Hosea and Amos show, at an end, and a chronological system was in vogue (p. 661). He also investigates P and finds that the holiness laws of P^h (S) are older than the original *Grundschrift*, P^g (p. 644). The laws of P^h, he thinks, are known and used in P^g (p. 654). He maintains that the prophet Ezekiel lives and moves in P^h and presupposes everywhere these laws (pp. 645-647), though he finds it difficult to say which laws were known to Ezekiel, and finds like difficulty in analyzing the laws of P^h (p. 640). At the same time he is sure that the laws of P^h are older than these of P^g (p. 644), and older also than Deuteronomy, as Deuteronomy seeks to restore a host of older customs through certain expressions (p. 646 comp. p. 605). He is convinced that Deuteronomy presupposes the laws concerning leprosy, and of clean and unclean animals, and claims that this arouses a favorable prejudice for the remaining laws (p. 647). He holds it as very unlikely that the priests in the literary period of the kings noted nothing of their statutes, and so he disputes vigorously on these grounds that the codification of the laws of P^h began first in the exile. On the other hand, he admits that P^g contains laws which in the historical life of the people first came into use after the time of Ezra (p. 651). He finds by further investigation that the laws of Deuteronomy are not used in P^g which, on the contrary, shows strong deflections from P^g. In proving the priority of P^g to Deuteronomy it is of great weight (p. 655) that in P^g all polemic against Deuteronomy is wanting. He therefore makes the proposition that Deuteronomy is dependent on P^g. Comparing further P^g with J he attempts to show, though with evidently less conviction, that there is a dependence of the *Ur-geschichte* in J on P^g. For example, the history of the creation and the flood in P^g is older, he thinks, than that in J (p. 656). He also claims that E is older than J (p. 655f.) as J borrows from E and is evidently dependent on E. In this Dillmann agrees with Schrader, Kayser, and Reuss, and opposes

Wellhausen, Kuenen, Stade, Budde, and others who maintain that J is older than E. Dillmann's analysis of Deuteronomy is also interesting and instructive. He lays great stress on its being a prophetic law-book, and reclaims as much for the original kernel as possible. What Wellhausen and Cornill consider a secondary introduction, Dillmann claims belonged to the original Deuteronomy. He allows that the book passed through the hands of a redactor, R^d, who made certain changes and transpositions; *e. g.*, 11:29-32 is removed from its original place after 27:1-3 and has been glossed over; 11:26-28 stood originally behind chapter 28 (p. 288). In Deuteronomy 1:1-4:40 he distinguishes at once 4:1-40 and 1:1-3:29, and shows that they have no important relation to each other. The historical archæological notes in 2:10-12, 20-23; 3:9-11 sound very strangely in the mouth of God or Moses. Hence he holds that they are better explained as a reported introduction, and argues that R^d in uniting Deuteronomy to the other previous books has shifted an original historical introduction of Deuteronomy, and made it into a speech of Moses in order to avoid a simple repetition (pp. 227, 683),—a procedure which he also accepts, on account of v. 8, for the explanation of Joshua 22 (p. 576). All contradictions brought up by other critics between the historical introduction and chapters 5-26, Dillmann thinks can be satisfactorily explained, *e. g.*, 2:14f. which conflicts with 5:2f.; 11:2-7, shows the hand of R^d who created contradictions through trying to harmonize two accounts.

Regarding the redaction and uniting of the different codes of the Hexateuch, Dillmann maintains the following order¹: 1) P^g+E+J. 2) P^g E J+D. 3) P^g E J D+P^h. He recognizes the close relation between J and E but holds that it was not J+E and then J E+P^g, but immediately P^g+E+J; that is, P^g, E and J were united all at the same time (p. 677). There is likewise a bond of union between J E and P^g, indeed they are so closely worked together that only a sharp criticism can discern the seams which separate them, *e. g.*, P^g and J in Gen. 6:9-9:17; chapters 13, 16, 34, etc.; and P^g with E in Num. 20:1-13 (p.

¹The Grafian-Wellhausen order on the contrary is: 1) J+E. 2) J E+D. 3) J E D+P.

677f.). Dillmann claims that the idea of a supplementary unifying of P^g with J E raises a series of difficulties which are easily solved by the supposition of a unification of all three sources *at the same time*. A proof of this is, that in Gen. 21:1-7 it might well be understood how in E J, vss. 3-5 have been inserted later or supplemented out of P^g; but it is not possible to see how vs. 16 (P^g) is added to vs. 1a (J) which is identical; and neither is it possible to see how the reference in vs. 26 (P^g) has been changed so as to refer back to 17:21 (P^g) and not to 18:14 (J). Hence the later working in of P^g into J E is impossible (p. 678). Moreover, there are cases where the *harmonist* in uniting E and J made use of expressions in P^g; and there are also cases in which the harmonist of J, E and P^g used expressions belonging to J. Dillmann, therefore, argues that J and E are better understood when we consider J and E as two separate sources lying before the redactor who united E, J and P^g (p. 679). Also he claims that to the Deuteronomist E and J still lay as two separate and independent compositions. Hence he places the joining of E, J and P^g as *subsequent* to the composition of D. For the postponement of it till the time of the exile there is no reason at hand, as any hint of this event is entirely wanting (p. 680f.). The redactor of P^g E J on the contrary knew D, he thinks, and hence he concludes that P^g, E and J were united in the twenty or thirty years before the exile. A second stage of redaction took place in the early part of the exile, when D was added to P^g E J, or rather as he prefers to think, D was completed through P^g E J (pp. 682-684). Later in the exile also, the remaining traditions of the cult, existing groups of *Torah* now found in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers (P^h) were collected and added to P^g E J D making P^g E J D P^h, by which time a further production of law was impossible (pp. 685-689).

Dillmann's view of the Hexateuch may be briefly stated, therefore, as follows:

- 1) The oldest code is E (B), written by a prophet of Ephraim, about 850 B.C.
- 2) The next oldest is P (A), written by a priest of Judah, about 800 B.C.

3) The third oldest is J (C), written by a prophet of Judah, about 750 B.C.

4) Following these is D, dependent on P, and written in the time of Josiah.

5) Following the composition of D,—twenty or thirty years before the exile,—P^g, E and J are united.

6) Then early in the exile P^g E J are added to D, enlarging and completing it.

7) Finally in the latter part of the exile P^h (S) is added to P^g E J D and the law of Ezra is practically complete. The text was, however, not yet fixed, as the Samaritan and Septuagint variants show. That Dillmann's view of the Hexateuch, especially his idea that P is of pre-exilic origin, is not nearer the truth than that of the modern school, remains yet to be shown.

2. *His position concerning Isaiah and other Old Testament books.*

In his commentary on Isaiah, Dillmann refuses to go to the extravagant extremes of Duham and Cornill, who assign parts of Isaiah's prophecies to the Maccabean age. He is unable himself, however, to assign more than twenty-two chapters with certainty to the prophet Isaiah. He dates the non-Isaianic portions as follows: 21:1–10 was composed not far from 549 B.C., 13:2–14:23 not long after 21:1–10 in the last half of the exile; 23:1–18 from the beginning of the fifth century; 34 and 35 are towards the end of the exile; 36–39 are by a deuteronomist from the books of Kings; 24–27 are from the first sixty or seventy years after 536 B.C.; 40–66 are a *unit*, and for the most part after 546 B.C., the last section being probably between 546 and 538 B.C.

In the case of Job, the subject of the book is “*das Leiden des Gerechten*.” He rejects the speech of Elihu on account of its long-drawn-out sentences, and the lack of the regular strophes common to the clear, short sentences of the other parts, and concludes that it has been added by a later hand,—by one who, after reading the book of Job through, put into Elihu's mouth what Job had failed to say concerning righteousness, thus improving the book. He acknowledges that the book shows traces of

redaction, but rejects Cheyne's idea that it is a compilation of six smaller books. He assigns it to the period between 596 and 585 B.C. as being the most probable date. That the book is post-exilic, Dillmann considers "unthinkable"; that it was written in the Greek period, "foolish." Concerning the other Old Testament books, Dillmann, in his lectures on *Introduction* (not likely to be published; though he had hoped to write a commentary on the Psalms), held that none of the Psalms is Maccabean, that Joel is pre-exilic, that Zechariah 9-11; 13:7-9 is by a contemporary of Isaiah, that Obadiah and Zechariah 12:1-13:6; 14 are out of the end of the exile, that Jonah is a book of history out of the Persian times, that Ecclesiastes is also out of the Persian period but very late and at a time when the name *Jahwe* was considered too sacred to be used, that Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are a unit and the work of one author, that Daniel was composed between 175 and 168 B.C., or before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, and, that Esther is the latest of all the canonical books of the Old Testament.

From this brief survey of the life and work of Dr. Dillmann, it is not difficult to form an opinion of the breadth and depth of his scholarship. In Æthiopic he was a *discoverer*. He unearthed a buried language, opening up to the world by his volumes, especially through his *Grammar* and *Lexicon*, a new field of history and literature. His work in this department has called forth the praises of scholars on every hand, even in Abyssinia. His fame has reached her distant cloisters, and Dr. Dillmann is held, according to the traveller Schweinfurth, "the first authority in the language and literature of the *Geez*." But Dr. Dillmann was more than an Æthiopic scholar. He was also a *Hebraist* and a *critic*. In order to do valid and lasting work in criticism, he felt that a knowledge of comparative Semitics was indispensable. He was therefore, as O. C. Whitehouse remarks, "*par excellence* a Semitic philologist. His commentaries are unrivalled for learning, acumen, lucidity and conciseness. . . . Every ray of light from the firmaments of archæology, philology, and eastern travel is focussed, as by a powerful lens, upon the Hebrew text" (*Expositor*, February, 1888). His method in Old Testament criticism and

exegesis was the historico-philological which he learned in the school of Ewald. Those who sat under him were wont to pronounce him above everything else an *exegete*. Two other prominent characteristics were *thoroughness* and *punctuality*. He never hurried, yet he was always prompt. Slowly and carefully he explained everything in its proper order and place. He had a method and followed it. No pains were spared to throw all the light possible on the dark portions of the Old Testament. He used the Septuagint freely, but recognized its fallibility. He could make nothing of Wellhausen's Q₁ Q₂ Q₃, J₁ J₂ J₃, E₁ E₂ E₃, but "hypotheses due to embarrassment." In a word, he was characterized by independence of judgment and clear, good, common-sense.

In May, 1893, the faculty and students of the University of Berlin celebrated his seventieth birthday anniversary by holding in his honor a "*grossen Jubelkommers*." Fourteen student *Vereins* took part. Of the faculty, among those present were the Rector of the University, Professor Virchow; and in the theological department Professors Kaftan, Pfeiderer, Harnack, Lommatzsch, Kunze, Müller, v. Soden, and Titius. A song was composed and sung in his honor, and speeches of congratulation and praise were made by many of those present. Dr. Dillmann's own words on this occasion give a clue to the motives which governed his life's work. He said: "I have always endeavored to hold myself aloof from all hypotheses; and in giving instruction, to give the youth a solid ground of truth on which to stand. '*Vorwärts*' has been my watchword, but not forwards into the wild streams of the day, but rather into what science has recognized as true. I have always endeavored to promote the morality and work for the best interests of the students under me." Such also is the verdict of all who knew him.

For ninety-two consecutive *Semesters*, or since 1848, Dr. Dillmann lectured, and (as university tradition adds) without missing an hour. His last exercise was in *Seminar*, June 23, in which for two hours he discussed the first six verses of the last chapter of Malachi, emphasizing the thought in vs. 1 that, "the Lord shall *suddenly* come to his temple," and closing with vs. 6a "for

I am the Lord, I change not." Unusually pale and fatigued he dismissed the class with his usual remark, "*das Weitere das nächste Mal.*" This was, however, his last exercise in the University he so much loved. After a brief illness of eleven days, he died, falling peacefully asleep. He leaves a wife, two sons and three daughters. In his home Dr. Dillmann was a patriarch. All who ever had the good fortune of having been invited by him to *Abendbrod* know how kind and hospitable he was in his home. Though given to hard and laborious study he always had time to entertain friends, or help those who needed his assistance. His study door was never closed to his family. He was a man of broad sympathies and a great heart.

That Dr. Dillmann is considered an extraordinary loss to the thinking theological world, the floods of letters which have come in to the family since his death clearly show. Letters from Professors and Court-preachers,—Steinmeyer, Dryander, Frommel, and many others,—in Berlin, from the theological faculty of Giessen, and from prominent orientalists the world over; from Kautsch of Halle, Köhler of Erlangen, Smend of Göttingen, Stade of Giessen, Gregory of Leipzig, Budde of Strassburg, Bezold of Heidelberg, Glasser of Saaz in Böhmen, Hommel of Munich, Reinnisch of Vienna, Riessel of Zurich, Matthes of Amsterdam, Halévy and Zotenberg of Paris, Carlo of Rome, Pereira of Lisbon, Cheyne of Oxford, Adam Smith and D. R. Alexander of Glasgow, Francis Brown of New York, Curtiss of Chicago, and many others, all mentioning with praise the "maturity of his criticism," the "earnest self-examination of all his researches," his "scientific investigations in theology," his "labors in Æthiopic," the "nobility of his family," his "warm religious life," his "blameless Christian character," and the "calamity his death brings to Old Testament research."

BERLIN, August, 1894.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF DILLMANN.

[The following notes giving a memorandum of his life and writings were left by Dr. Dillmann to his family in his own handwriting, and by special permission are allowed to be used here. A translation is not necessary.]

Christian Friedrich August Dillmann, geb. 25. April 1823 in Illingen.

1828–Nov. 1832 wurde er bei seinem Vater unterrichtet in Deutsch u. Lateinisch.

1832–35 war er in Dürrmenz bei Pfarrer Kern in Pension.

1835–36 besuchte er die VI. Classe des Gymnasiums in Stuttgart.

1836–40 besuchte er das sogenannte "Niedere Seminar" von Württemberg in früheren Kloster Schöndal.

1840–44 im Seminar in Tübingen. Sept. '44 Erstes theolog. Examen bestanden mit I.—Gewann in '44 den ersten katechetischen Preis.

1844–1845 studierte er als Stipendiat der Stadt in Tübingen.

Sept. 1845 Theolog. Preisaufgabe über die Bildung des alttest. Kanons gewann.

Oct. 1845–1 Mai 1846, war er Pfarr-Vicar in Sersheim in der Nähe seines Heimatsorts.

14. Mai 1846 promovierte er in Tübingen zum Dr. phil.

Juni–Sept. 1846 befand er sich auf einer wissenschaftlichen Reise in Paris.

Sept. 1846–April 1848 hielt er sich in London u. Oxford auf.

Von Juli 1848–Sept. 1851 war er Repetent in Tübingen. Während dieser Zeit las er alle alttest. Collegien ausserdem orientalische Collegien.

Seit Herbst 1851 war er Privatdocent der Theologie in Tübingen.

In Febr. 1853 wurde er Prof.-extraordinarius hon. in Tübingen in der theolog. Fakultät.

Seit 1 Oct. 1854 war er Prof.-extraordinarius in der philosoph. Fakultät in Kiel für Altes Testament, Hebräisch, Arabisch, Syrisch, Äthiopisch u. Sanskrit.

Am 2 Dec. 1859 wurde er Professor-ordinarius.

1862 ward er zum Dr. theol. hon. causa von Leipzig ernannt.

Am 1 April 1864 ward er Prof. der Theologie in Giessen.

Am 10 Oct. 1869 trat er seine Professur in Berlin an.

1875–1876 war er Rektor der Universität Berlin.

1881 Präsident des V. internationalen Orientalisten-kongresses.

Während seiner Lehrthätigkeit erhielt er Berufungen; in Kiel: nach Marburg, Zürich u. Halle; in Giessen: nach Wien u. Tübingen; in Berlin: nach Tübingen (zweimal); hat sie aber alle ausgeschlagen.

1) Correspondent der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen seit 10 Nov. 1857. Auswärtiges Mitglied seit 7. Dec. '72.

2) Auswärtiges Mitglied der K. bayrischen Academie der Wissenschaften in München seit 25 Juli, 1872.

3) Ordentliches Mitglied der K. Academie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin seit 28 März 1877.

4) Auswärtiges Mitglied der Royal Asiatic Society in London seit 20 Febr. 1882.

5) Auswärtiges Mitglied der American Oriental Society seit 24 Mai 1882.

6) Honorary Member of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis seit 7 Sept. 1891.

Selbstständige Druckschriften.

1) *Catalogus codicum Mss. Orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur.* Pars III. *Codices Æthiopici.* Lond. impensis Musei Brit., 1847, fol. 79 S. S.

2) *Catalogus codicum Mss. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ Oxoniensis,* Pars VIII: *Codices Æthiopici,* digessit Oxon., 1848, 4°, 87 S. S.

3) *Liber Henoch Æthiopice,* Lips. Vogel, 1851, 4° 91 u. 38 S. S.

4) *Das Buch Henoch,* übersetzt u. erklärt, Leipz. Vogel, 1853, 8°, 331 S. S.

5) *Octateuchus Æthiopicus,* Lips. Vogel, 1853–5, 4°, 486 u. 220 S. S.

6) *Grammatik der æthiop. Sprache,* Leipz. Weigel, 1857, 8°, 435 S. S.

7) *Liber Jubilæorum Æthiopice,* Kiliax, 1859, 4°, 167 S. S.

8) *Lexicon linguæ Æthiopice,* Lips. Weigel, 1865, hoch 4°, 1522 Spalten.

9) *Chrestomathia Æthiopica,* Leipz. Weigel, 1866, 8°, 290 S. S.

10) *Erklärung des Buches Hiob,* Leipz. Hirzel, 1869, 8°, 370 S. S.—4^{te} Auflage 1891.

11) *Libri Regum,* Æthiopice 2 Hefte, 1871, 4°, 169 u. 137 S. S.

12) *Die Genesis* erklärt, Leipz. Hirzel, 8°, 1875, 495 S. S. Neue (4^{te}) Auflage 1882, 5^{te} 1886, 6^{te} Auflage 1892, 8°, 479 S. S.

13) *Ascensio Isaïæ,* Æthiopice et Latine, cum prolegominis, Lips. 1877, 8°, 86 S. S.

14) *Exodus u. Leviticus* erklärt, Leipz. Hirzel 1880, 8°, 639 S. S.

15) *Numeri, Deuteronomium, Josua* erklärt, Leipz. Hirzel, 1886, 8°, 690 S. S.

16) *Die abessynischen Handschriften* der K. Bibliothek zu Berlin mit 3 Tafeln, Berl. 1878, 4°, 85 S. S.

17) *Der Prophet Jesaja* erklärt, Leipz. Hirzel, 1890, 8°, 470 S. S.

18) *Veteris Testamenti Æthiopici, Libri Apocryphi,* Berl. 1894, 4°, pag. 221.

Aufsätze in Zeitschriften.

1) Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft, Bd. VII. 1853: Zur Geschichte des abessyn. Reichs. Königsverzeichnisse und Inschriften. S. 338–364. 2) In Ewald's Jahrbüchern der bibl. Wissenschaft. a) Jahrb. III. 1849, S. 230–256 u. IV. 1850–1, S. 1–96: Das Buch der Jubiläen. b) Jahrb.

V. 1852–53, S. 1–144: Das christliche Adambuch des Morgenlands. c) *ibid.* S. 144–151: Über dem Umfang des Bibelcanons der abessyn. Kirche. 3) In den Göttinger Gelehrten Nachrichten 1858, S. 185–226: Bericht über das Äthiopische Buch clementinischer Schriften. 4) In den Jahrbüchern für deutsche Theologie, Bd. III. 1858, S. 419–491: Über die Bildung der Sammlung heiliger Schriften des Alt. Test. 5) "Im neuen Reich," Leipz. Hirzel, 1875, S. 778–786. *Heinrich Ewald.* 6) In den Schriften der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.

A. *In den Monatsberichten*: 8°.

1) 1878, S. 413–429: Abfassungszeit des Periplus maris erythræi. 2) 1881, S. 429–433: Eine neuentdeckte punische Inschrift zu Sulci. 3) 1881, S. 601–620: Über Baal, mit dem weiblichen Artikel. 4) 1881, S. 914–935: Kalenderwesen der Israeliten vor dem babylon. Exil.

B. *In den Sitzungsberichten*: 8°.

1) 1882, S. 427–440: Die Herkunft der ungeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebräer. 2) 1883, S. 323–340: Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuchtextes. 3) 1884, S. 1007–1038: Die Kriegsthaten des Königs 'Amda-Sion gegen die Muslim. 4) 1885, S. 889–98: Über Pithom, Hero, Klysma nach Naville. 5) 1887, S. 339–356: Über die apokryphen Märtyrergeschichten des Cyriacus mit Julitta und des Georgius. 6) 1888, S. 215–237: Über das Adlergesicht in der Apocalypse des Esra. 7) 1890, S. 3–17: Bemerkungen zur Grammatik des Geez u. zur alten Geschichte Abessyniens. 8) 1890, S. 1345–1373: Textkritisches zum Buch Hiob. 9) 1892, S. 3–16: Über die griechische Übersetzung des Qoheleth. 10) 1892, S. 1037, 1039–1054: Über den neugefundenen griechischen Text des Henoch-Buches. Zweite Mittheilung, S. 1069, 1079–1092. 11) 1894, S. 1–19: Über die geschichtlichen Ergebnisse der Th. Bent'schen Reisen in Ostafrika.

C. *In den Abhandlungen*, 4°.

1) 1879, S. S. 61f.: Über die Anfänge des Axumitischen Reichs. 2) 1880, S. S. 51f.: Zur Geschichte des Axumitischen Reichs im 4^{ten} u. 6^{ten} Jahrh. 3) 1884, S. S. 79f.: Die Regierung insbesondere die Kirchenverfassung des Königs Zara'-Jacob. 4) 1885, S. S. 24f.: Gedächtnissrede auf Richard Lepsius.

Universitäts-Programme.

1) Giessener Antrittsrede: Über den Ursprung der alttest. Religion, Giesen, Rickert, 1865, 8°. 2) Giessener Rectoratsrede: Über die Propheten des alten Bundes nach ihrer politischen Wirksamkeit, 1868, 4°. 3) Giessener Rectoratsrede: Über die kleinen Universitäten, 1869, 4°. 4) Berliner Rectoratsrede: Über die Theologie als Universitätswissenschaft., 1875, 4°. 5) Berliner Rectoratsrede: Über den Verfall des Islam, 1876, 4°.

Betheiligung an Sammelwerken.

1) Realencyclopädie für praktische Theologie u. Kirche von Herzog., 1854ff. a) Äthiop. Bibelübersetzung. b) Bibeltext des A. T. c) Chronik.

d) Pseudoepigraphen des A. T. Dieselben in neuer Bearbeitung für die II. Aufl. von Herzog.-Plitt-Hauck. 2) In Schenkel's Bibellexicon, Leipz. 1869–75. Bd. I.: Äthiopien u. Kusch, Bund, Cherubim u. David. Bd. II.: Eden, Elam, Feste, Gesetz u. Gesetzgebung. Bd. III.: Henoch, Jebusiter, Kanaan, Kanaaniter, Kirchweihfest. Bd. IV.: Laubhüttenfest, Michal, Nabal, Naph-tuchin, Nasiräer, Nathan, Noah, Paradies, Passah, Peresiton, Perez, Perser, Persien, Pfingsten, Propheten. Bd. V.: Purimfest, Rephaim, Salomo, Saul, Sirach, Seraphim, Suchim, Sündflut, Thirsaka,—35 Artikel. 3) An Brockhaus Conversations Lexicon, von der 11–13^{ten} Auflage mit vielen Artikeln. Hat die Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie von Bd. XX.–XXIII., 1875–78 mit herausgegeben. Hat auch die Verhandlungen des V. internationalen Orientalisten-congresses Bd. I., II., 1–2, Berlin 1881–82, herausgegeben.